

Application No.: 09/775,321  
Amendment dated: January 16, 2006  
Reply to final Office Action of: July 15, 2005

### REMARKS

In response to the final Office Action dated July 15, 2005, Applicants are submitting a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) with a preliminary amendment for the Examiner's continued consideration. By this preliminary amendment, Applicants have amended the claims and presented arguments that distinguish those claims from the prior art.

#### Objection to the Drawings

The Examiner objected to the drawings because proper legends were missing. Applicants have accommodated the Examiner's objection by including legends on FIGS. 7 and 9 (see attached drawing figures).

#### Objection to the Claims

The Examiner objected to claims 24-27 for lack of antecedent basis. Applicants have accommodated the Examiner's objections by the above claim amendments, which provide proper antecedent bases for the claim terms.

#### Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Applicants note that claims 23-30 were previously rejected as being unpatentable over selected combinations of U.S. Patent No. 6,584,490 to Schuster et al. ("Schuster"), U.S. Patent No. 5,644,516 to Podwalny et al. ("Podwalny"), U.S. Patent No. 6,668,046 to Albal ("Albal"), and U.S. Patent No. 6,735,614 to Payne et al. ("Payne"). The Examiner relied on Albal for a teaching of a routing profile. In particular, the Examiner noted that "*obtaining telephone numbers*" disclosed at col. 4, line 27, in Albal, satisfies Applicants' claimed step of "*receiving a selected routing profile*."

Applicants respectfully submit that this application of Albal's teaching to Applicants' claimed invention is improper. The referenced teaching in Albal's disclosure appears to relate to outgoing calls and Applicants' claimed step of "*routing profiles*" relates to the control of incoming calls. Thus, even assuming that Schuster, Podwalny, and Payne teach all that the Examiner alleges, a combination of these references with Albal would not satisfy Applicants'

Application No.: 09/775,321  
Amendment dated: January 16, 2006  
Reply to final Office Action of: July 15, 2005

claims. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 23-30 is respectfully traversed at least based on the fact that Albal's disclosure is deficient and does not teach what is claimed.

Favorable consideration and allowance of the claims pending here is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 16, 2006

By: /Reena Kuyper/  
Reena Kuyper  
Registration No. 33,830

Berry & Associates P.C.  
9255 Sunset Blvd., Suite 810  
Los Angeles, CA 90069  
(310) 247-2860